

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,763	07/22/2003	F. Coyne Prenger	S-100,646	7843
7:	7590 03/13/2006		EXAMINER	
Bruce H. Cottrell			BARRY, CHESTER T	
Los Alamos Na	tional Laboratory			
LC/IP, MS A187			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Los Alamos, NM 87545			1724	

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/625,763	PRENGER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Chester T. Barry	1724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 De	ecember 2005.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	, —					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	33 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 31 and 34-36 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 31 and 34-36 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
I) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/625,763 Page 2

Art Unit: 1724

Claims 31, 34 – 36 are rejected under 35 USC Sec. 103(a) as obvious over Lidzey. USP 5441648 to Lidzey describes a mixing chamber A, a ball matrix within a magnetic separator, and an outlet F. The balls of the matrix are 2 cm diameter "magnetic stainless steel balls." Magnetic balls of this size made from stainless steel inherently exhibit remnant magnetism. It is noted that applicant's stainless steel steel wool exhibits remnant magnetism (Specification, page 13 lines 12-15). The ref. describes placing magnetite and water to be decontaminated in the feed tank A, but does not appear to describe two inlet conduits for adding contaminated water and magnetite into the feed tank. It would have been obvious to have provided the stirred feed tank with conduit for separately adding contaminated water and magnetite to the feed tank A in order to facilitate continuous processing of the water. The patent describes adding water at E and draining water out at D. It would have been obvious to have provided the water to E via a conduit to facilitate continuous operation of the matrix backwashing process.

Per claim 36, the ref. describes the ball matrix chamber as on having a cross sectional area of about (13×4) cm², or about 52 cm² (at col 2 line 65). At the water flow rates described in the ref., i.e., 4, 2, and 1 L/min (see col/line 4/37), the superficial water velocity through the magnetic separator is inherently described as about 1.3, 0.6, and 0.3 cm/sec.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that Lidzey does not describes a matrix exhibiting remnant magnetism. The examiner disagrees because Lidzey teaches shutting off the electromagnetic, and because applicant's remnant-magnetic matrix is made from stainless steel, the same material from which Lidzey's ball matrix is made. USP 6383397 teaches that it is difficult to remove residual magnetism from magnetized substances or elements shortly after the magnetic field is removed by cutting the electrical current.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

CHESTERT. BARRY

571-272-1152